



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,663	06/11/2008	Chaitan Khosla	STAN-258US7 (S03-282)	9377
24353 7590 10/11/2011 BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP 1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE SUITE 200 EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303			EXAMINER AUDET, MAURY A	
			ART UNIT 1654	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/11/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/579,663

Applicant(s)

KHOSLA ET AL.

Examiner

MAURY AUDET

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/12/11.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on ____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) 9-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-302)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Parent US7265093 is drawn to a method of treating Celiac Sprue using a very similar genus product tTGase inhibitor. It is noted that the R2 in the parent are not expressly drawn to molecules claimed here (e.g. (S)-Bn), but since they can operate as "peptidic protecting groups" under the lattes broadest reasonably interpretation, which is claimed here as an option for R1 or R2, an Obvious Double Patenting Rejection is applied below. All the other variable and the core structure overlap.

Related US 7579313 is drawn to the negatively claimed compound of present claim 1, and is not overlapping.

Request for Information

Although every attempt was made to review all related claimed formulas in this large tTGase inhibitor family, if the Examiner has overlapped any pending or patenting claims which overlap the presently claimed formula Applicant is asked to provide a list thereof and/or Terminal Discliamers/amendments as necessary.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-8 and new claim 13 (drawn to elected species), in the reply filed on 8/12/11 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Castelhana et al. I (US 4,912,120) or Castelhana et al. II (US 4,929,630) (also cited in one or more related applications - including the parent to this application, although drawn to methods of use (which Applicant traversed since the method was not taught or suggested) - are drawn to overlapping structures which was not disputed).

Castelhana et al. I & II expressly teach, compounds overlapping the presently claimed genus structure; by example, the present negatively claimed isoxazole moiety compound (elected compound of invention) {(S)-1-[(3-Bromo-4,5-dihydro-isoxazol-5-ylmethyl)-carbamoyl]-2-phenyl-ethyl}-carbamic acid benzyl ester (e.g. associated RN #'s: 115329-49-2, 120245-03-6, 120244-83-9, 148416-83-5), which was patented in related application US7579313 (for a method of treating celiac sprue), for use as a transglutaminase inhibitor (entire documents, each), orally and in any known formulation at the time (e.g. enteric coated). (As previously noted, although Castelhana et al. I & II teach the use of the compound to mammals suffering from a disease characterized by elevated transglutaminase activity, e.g. acne, psoriasis, cataracts, etc.; the references do not expressly include Celiac Sprue in the examples of diseases/disorders within this genus.)

Art Unit: 1654

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrive at the same genus or species thereof of tTGase inhibitors, including the presently elected species (claim 13) if not expressly taught, because both Castelhana et al. I & II expressly teach large varied genres comprising the same and contemplate modifying the same variable regions. The product teachings of both Castelhana et al. I & II were not disputed in the parent to this application.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the reference, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

Art Unit: 1654

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 7265095 (parent, also with this Examiner) Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '095's, although drawn to methods of use, nevertheless use products overlapping with those presently claimed. Namely, the R2 variable although not expressly drawn to molecules claimed here (e.g. (S)-Bn), may nevertheless operate as "peptidic protecting groups" under the latter's broadest reasonably interpretation, which is claimed here as an option for R1 or R2. All the other variable and the core structure overlap.

Art Unit: 1654

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MAURY AUDET whose telephone number is (571)272-0960. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th. 7AM-5:30PM (10 Hrs.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecelia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MA, 10/3/11

/Maury Audet/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654